

Hopf maximum principle violation for elliptic equations with non-Lipschitz nonlinearity

Y. Il'yasov *

Institute of Mathematics RAS,
Ufa, Russia

Y. Egorov

Université Paul Sabatier,
Toulouse, France

Abstract

We consider elliptic equations with non-Lipschitz nonlinearity

$$-\Delta u = \lambda |u|^{\beta-1} u - |u|^{\alpha-1} u$$

in a smooth bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, with Dirichlet boundary conditions; here $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$. We prove the existence of a weak nonnegative solution which does not satisfy the Hopf boundary maximum principle, provided that λ is large enough and $n > 2(1 + \alpha)(1 + \beta)/(1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta)$.

1 Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$ with a smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, which is strictly star-shaped with respect to the origin in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We consider the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda |u|^{\beta-1} u - |u|^{\alpha-1} u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

Here λ is a real parameter and $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$, so that the nonlinearity $f(\lambda, u) := \lambda |u|^{\beta-1} u - |u|^{\alpha-1} u$ on the right-hand side of (1.1) is non-Lipschitzian at zero.

*The first author was partly supported by grants RFBR 08-01-00441-a, 08-01-97020-p-a

Our interest to this problem has been induced by investigations of J.I. Díaz, J. Hernández in paper [1]. In case of dimension $n = 1$ when $\Omega = (-1, 1)$, among other results, they showed that for certain values $\lambda > 0$ equation (1.1) possesses solutions $u(x)$, $x \in (-1, 1)$ with a special feature

$$u(-1) = u(1) = 0, \quad u'(-1) = u'(1) = 0. \quad (1.2)$$

This means a Hopf boundary maximum principle violation on $x = -1$, $x = 1$ and a loss of the uniqueness for initial value problem to (1.1) with $u(-1) = u'(1) = 0$, since $u \equiv 0$ satisfies also to (1.1). Furthermore, it can easily be shown that the existence of such a solution with $\lambda_0 > 0$ yields the existence of a set continuum nonnegative solutions of this boundary value problem for any $\lambda > \lambda_0$. Observe that property (1.2) implies that a function u is also a weakly solution of (1.1) on the whole line $\mathbb{R}$. Note that when the nonlinearity $f(\lambda, u)$ is a locally Lipschitz function such a phenomenon is impossible due to the uniqueness solution of initial value problem and/or a Hopf boundary maximum principle.

This rise a question *as to whether the similar phenomena may be occurred in case of the higher dimensions $n > 1$* . More precisely whether the Hopf boundary maximum principle holds for (1.1) when $n > 1$ and the nonlinearity $f(\lambda, u)$ is non-Lipschitz. To find an answer to this question is a main goal in the present work.

Let us state our main result. We consider a weak solution $u \in H_0^1 := H_0^1(\Omega)$, where $H_0^1(\Omega)$ denotes the closure $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ in standard Sobolev space $H^1(\Omega)$ with the norm $\|\cdot\|_1$. We say that a weak solution $u \in H_0^1$ of (1.1) is a non-regular, if $u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$.

Our main result is the following

Theorem 1.1 *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$ with smooth boundary, which is strictly star-shaped with respect to the origin. Assume that $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$ and $n > 2(1 + \alpha)(1 + \beta)/(1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta)$. Then there exists $\lambda^* > 0$ such that for all $\lambda \geq \lambda^*$ problem (1.1) has a non-regular solution u_λ , which is nonnegative in Ω . Moreover, the number of such solutions for $\lambda > \lambda^*$ is infinite.*

Furthermore, for any $\lambda > \lambda^$ problem (1.1) has a weak solution $w_\lambda \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, which is nonnegative in Ω but is not non-regular solution, i.e. $\frac{\partial w_\lambda}{\partial \nu} \neq 0$ on some subset $U \subseteq \partial\Omega$ of positive $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure.*

The proof of the theorem relies on the variational arguments. Furthermore, basic ingredients in the proof consist in using Pohozaev's identity [4] corresponding to (1.1) and in applying the spectral analysis with respect to the fibering procedure introduced in [3].

Remark 1.1. If one considers the radial symmetric solutions of (1.1) in the ball B_R , then the second part of Theorem 1.1 implies that the weak radial solution w_λ of (1.1) is positive in the ball B_R and satisfies the Hopf boundary maximum principle, i.e. $\frac{\partial u_\lambda}{\partial \nu}(R) < 0$.

Remark 1.2. In the theory of integrable systems, the non-regular type solutions are known as the compactons: solitary waves with compact support [5].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we apply the spectral analysis related with the fibering procedure [3] to introduce two spectral points Λ_0, Λ_1 which play basic role in the proof of the main result. In Section 3, we derive some important consequences from Pohozaev's identity. In Section 4, we prove existence of the solution to an auxiliary constrained minimization problem. In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.1. Section 6 is an appendix where some technical result is proved.

2 Spectral analysis with respect to the fibering procedure

In this section we apply the spectral analysis with respect to the fibering procedure [3] to introduce two spectral points which will play important roles in the proof of the main result.

Observe that problem (1.1) is the Euler-Lagrange equation of the functional

$$E_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{2}T(u) - \lambda \frac{1}{\beta+1}B(u) + \frac{1}{\alpha+1}A(u), \quad (2.1)$$

where we use the notations

$$T(u) = \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx, \quad B(u) = \int_{\Omega} u^{\beta+1} dx, \quad A(u) = \int_{\Omega} u^{\alpha+1} dx.$$

Let $u \in H_0^1$. Consider the function $e_\lambda(t) := E_\lambda(tu)$ defined for $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Introduce the functionals $Q_\lambda(u) = e'_\lambda(t)|_{t=1}$, $L_\lambda(u) = e''_\lambda(t)|_{t=1}$ for $u \in H_0^1$. Then

$$Q_\lambda(u) = T(u) - \lambda B(u) + A(u), \quad L_\lambda(u) := T(u) - \lambda\beta B(u) + \alpha A(u).$$

Let $u \in H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}$. Following the spectral analysis [3], we solve the system

$$\begin{cases} Q_\lambda(tu) = t^2 T(u) - \lambda t^{1+\beta} B(u) + t^{1+\alpha} A(u) = 0 \\ E_\lambda(tu) = \frac{t^2}{2} T(u) - \lambda \frac{t^{1+\beta}}{1+\beta} B(u) + \frac{t^{1+\alpha}}{1+\alpha} A(u) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

and find the corresponding solution

$$t_0(u) = \left(\frac{2(\beta - \alpha)}{(1 + \alpha)(1 - \beta)} \frac{A(u)}{T(u)} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\lambda_0(u) = c_0^{\alpha, \beta} \lambda(u),$$

where

$$c_0^{\alpha, \beta} = \frac{(1 - \alpha)(1 + \beta)}{(1 - \beta)(1 + \alpha)} \left(\frac{(1 + \alpha)(1 - \beta)}{2(\beta - \alpha)} \right)^{\frac{\beta - \alpha}{1 - \alpha}}$$

and

$$\lambda(u) = \frac{A(u)^{\frac{1-\beta}{1-\alpha}} T(u)^{\frac{\beta-\alpha}{1-\alpha}}}{B(u)}. \quad (2.4)$$

Thus with respect to the fibering procedure, we have the following spectral point

$$\Lambda_0 = \inf_{H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}} \lambda_0(u). \quad (2.5)$$

Introduce the second point Λ_1 . Let $u \in H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}$. Consider now the following system

$$\begin{cases} Q_\lambda(tu) = t^2 T(u) - \lambda t^{1+\beta} B(u) + t^{1+\alpha} A(u) = 0 \\ L_\lambda(tu) = t^2 T(u) - \lambda \beta t^{1+\beta} B(u) + \alpha t^{1+\alpha} A(u) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Solving this system we find as above

$$\lambda_1(u) = c_1^{\alpha, \beta} \lambda(u), \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$c_1^{\alpha, \beta} = \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 - \beta} \left(\frac{1 - \beta}{\beta - \alpha} \right)^{\frac{\beta - \alpha}{1 - \alpha}}. \quad (2.8)$$

Then we have

$$\Lambda_1 = \inf_{H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}} \lambda_1(u). \quad (2.9)$$

Proposition 2.1 $0 < \Lambda_1 < \Lambda_0 < +\infty$.

Proof. Observe that $\lambda_1(u) = C^{\alpha,\beta} \lambda_0(u)$ for any $u \in H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}$ with $C^{\alpha,\beta} = c_0^{\alpha,\beta}/c_1^{\alpha,\beta}$. It is not hard to show that $C^{\alpha,\beta} < 1$, therefore $\Lambda_1 < \Lambda_0$.

It is clear that $\Lambda_0 < +\infty$. Let us show that $0 < \Lambda_1$. Note that $\lambda(u)$ is a zero-homogeneous function on $H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore we may restrict the infimum in (2.9) to the set $S := \{v \in H_0^1 : \|v\|_1 = 1\}$.

Set

$$\gamma = \frac{(1+\alpha)(2^*-1-\beta)}{(2^*-1-\alpha)}, \quad p = \frac{(1+\alpha)}{\gamma}, \quad q = \frac{2^*}{(1+\beta-\gamma)}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $2^* = 2n/(n-2)$. Then $p, q > 1$, $1/p + 1/q = 1$ and by the Hölder inequality we have

$$B(u) \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{2^*} dx \right)^{1/q} \cdot A(u)^{1/p}. \quad (2.11)$$

By Sobolev's inequality

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{2^*} dx \leq C_0 \|u\|_1^{2^*} = C_0 < +\infty.$$

for $u \in S$, where C_0 does not depend on $u \in H_0^1$. Hence for any $u \in S$ we have

$$\lambda(u) = \frac{A(u)^{(1-\beta)}}{B(u)^{(1-\alpha)}} \geq c_0 A(u)^{-\frac{(2^*-2)(\beta-\alpha)}{(2^*-1-\alpha)}}, \quad (2.12)$$

where $0 < c_0 < +\infty$ does not depend on $u \in H_0^1$. Since $A(u) \leq C_1 < +\infty$ on S we see from (2.5) that $\Lambda_1 > 0$. ■

3 Pohozaev's identity

We will need the following regularity result

Proposition 3.1 *Assume that $0 < \alpha < \beta < 1$. Suppose that $u \in H_0^1$ is a weak solution of (1.1). Then $u \in C^{1,\kappa}(\overline{\Omega})$ for $\kappa \in (0, 1)$.*

Proof. Let $u \in H_0^1$ be a weak solution of (1.1). Since $|f(\lambda, u)| < C(1 + |u|)$, $u \in \mathbb{R}$ with some $C > 0$, then (see Lemma B.3 in [6]) $u \in L^q(\Omega)$ for any $q < \infty$. This implies that $-\Delta u = f(\lambda, u) \in L^q(\Omega)$ for any $q < \infty$. Thus, by the Caldéron-Zygmund inequality (see [2])

$u \in H^{2,q}(\Omega)$, whence $u \in C^{1,\kappa}(\overline{\Omega})$ for $\kappa \in (0,1)$ by the Sobolev embedding theorem. $\blacksquare$

We will denote by P_λ the functional

$$P_\lambda(u) := \frac{(n-2)}{2n}T(u) - \lambda \frac{1}{\beta+1}B(u) + \frac{1}{\alpha+1}A(u)$$

defined for $u \in H_0^1$.

Lemma 3.1 *Suppose that Ω is a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 3$, which is strictly star-shaped with respect to the origin in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let u be a weak solution of (1.1), $u \in H_0^1$. Then the following Pohozaev identity holds*

$$P_\lambda(u) + \frac{1}{2n} \int \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} \right|^2 x \cdot \nu dx = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.1 we know that $u \in H^{2,2} \cap C^1 \cap H_0^1$. Thus, since $f(\lambda, u)$ is a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$, we are in position to apply Lemma 1.4 in [6], that completes the proof. $\blacksquare$

Let $u \in H_0^1$. Based on the ideas of the spectral analysis with respect to the fibering procedure [3] we consider the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} Q_\lambda(u) := T(u) - \lambda B(u) + A(u) = 0 \\ L_\lambda(u) := T(u) - \lambda \beta B(u) + \alpha A(u) = 0 \\ P_\lambda(u) := \frac{(n-2)}{2n}T(u) - \lambda \frac{1}{\beta+1}B(u) + \frac{1}{\alpha+1}A(u) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

The computation of the corresponding determinant shows that this system is solvable if and only if

$$\theta \equiv 2(1+\alpha)(1+\beta) - n(1-\alpha)(1-\beta) = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Note that $\theta < 0$ if and only if

$$n > 2(1+\alpha)(1+\beta)/(1-\alpha)(1-\beta).$$

Observe that the equation $e'_\lambda(t) = 0$, $t > 0$ has at most two roots $t^1(u) := t_\lambda^1(u) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $t^2(u) := t_\lambda^2(u) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $t^1(u) \leq t^2(u)$, $e''_\lambda(t^1(u)) \leq 0$ and $e''_\lambda(t^2(u)) \geq 0$.

Proposition 3.2 *Assume that $\theta < 0$. If $u \in H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}$ and $t > 0$ are such that $Q_\lambda(tu) = 0$ and $P_\lambda(tu) \leq 0$ then we have*

$$L_\lambda(tu) > 0.$$

Proof. Let $u \in H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}$ and $t > 0$ as in the assumption. Then

$$T(u) = \lambda t^{\beta-1} B(u) - t^{\alpha-1} A(u) \quad (3.4)$$

$$L_\lambda(tu) > 0 \Leftrightarrow \lambda t^{\beta-\alpha} \frac{(1-\beta)}{(1-\alpha)} B(u) > A(u). \quad (3.5)$$

Equality (3.4) implies that $P_\lambda(t^1(u)u) \leq 0$ holds if and only if

$$\lambda t^{\beta-\alpha} \frac{[2(1+\beta) + n(1-\beta)](1+\alpha)}{[2(1+\alpha) + n(1-\alpha)](1+\beta)} B(u) \geq A(u). \quad (3.6)$$

Observe, that the inequality $\theta < 0$ implies

$$\frac{[2(1+\beta) + n(1-\beta)](1+\alpha)}{[2(1+\alpha) + n(1-\alpha)](1+\beta)} < \frac{(1-\beta)}{(1-\alpha)}. \quad (3.7)$$

Thus (3.7) and (3.6) give

$$\lambda t^{\beta-\alpha} \frac{(1-\beta)}{(1-\alpha)} B(u) > A(u)$$

and therefore by (3.5) the proof is complete. ■

Corollary 3.1 *If u_0 is a non-regular solution solution of (1.1) then $E_\lambda(u_0) > 0$. Furthermore, if in addition $\theta < 0$, then*

$$Q_\lambda(u_0) = 0, \quad P_\lambda(u_0) = 0, \quad L_\lambda(u_0) > 0.$$

Proof. Observe that if u_0 is the non-regular solution solution of (1.1), then by (3.1) we have $P_\lambda(u_0) = 0$. Hence using $E_\lambda(u) = P_\lambda(u) + (1/2n)T(u)$ we get

$$E_\lambda(u_0) = \frac{1}{n}T(u_0) > 0.$$

Note that $Q_\lambda(u_0) = 0$ if u_0 is a solution of (1.1), and $P_\lambda(u_0) = 0$ if in addition this solution is the non-regular solution solution. Hence assumption $\theta < 0$ and Proposition 3.2 imply that $L_\lambda(u_0) > 0$. ■

4 Constrained minimization problems

Consider the following constrained minimization problem:

$$\begin{cases} E_\lambda(u) \rightarrow \min \\ Q_\lambda(u) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

We denote by

$$M_\lambda := \{w \in H_0^1 : Q_\lambda(w) = 0\}$$

the admissible set of (4.1), and by $\hat{E}_\lambda := \min\{E_\lambda(u) : u \in M_\lambda\}$ the minimal value in this problem. We say that (u_m) is a minimizing sequence of (4.1), if

$$E_\lambda(u_m) \rightarrow \hat{E}_\lambda \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } u_m \in M_\lambda, \ m = 1, 2, \dots \quad (4.2)$$

Proposition 4.1 *If $\lambda > \Lambda_1$, then the set M_λ is not empty, meanwhile the set M_λ is empty when $\lambda < \Lambda_1$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda > \Lambda_1$. Then by (2.5) there exists $u \in H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\Lambda_1 < \lambda(u) < \lambda$ and $L_{\lambda(u)}(t(u)u) = 0$, $Q_{\lambda(u)}(t(u)u) = 0$. Hence, $Q_\lambda(t(u)u) < 0$, since $\lambda(u) < \lambda$ and therefore there exists $t > 0$ such that $Q_\lambda(tu) = 0$, i.e. $tu \in M_\lambda$.

The proof of the second part of the Proposition follows immediately from the definition (2.5) of Λ_1 . ■

From here it follows that

Corollary 4.1 $\hat{E}_\lambda < +\infty$ for any $\lambda > \Lambda_1$.

4.1 Existence of the solution of (4.1).

Lemma 4.1 *For any $\lambda > \Lambda_1$ problem (4.1) has a solution $u_0 \in H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}$, i.e. $E_\lambda(u_0) = \hat{E}_\lambda$ and $u_0 \in M_\lambda$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda > \Lambda_1$. Then M_λ is not empty and there is a minimizing sequence (u_m) of (4.1). Set $t_m \geq 0$ and $v_m \in H_0^1$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$, such that $u_m = t_m v_m$, $\|v_m\|_1 = 1$.

Let us show that $\{t_m\}$ is bounded. Observe that

$$1 - \lambda t_m^{\beta-1} B(v_m) + t_m^{\alpha-1} A(v_m) = 0, \quad (4.3)$$

since $Q_\lambda(t_m u_m) = 0$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$. Note that since $\|v_m\|_1 = 1$, $B(v_m), A(v_m)$ are bounded.

Suppose that there exists a subsequence again denoted (t_m) such that $t_m \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow +\infty$. Then the left hand side of (4.3) tends to 1 as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ what contradicts to the assumption $Q_\lambda(u_m) = 0$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$.

Suppose now that there exist subsequences again denoted (t_m) , (v_m) such that $t_m \rightarrow 0$ and/or $v_m \rightarrow 0$ weakly in H_0^1 as $m \rightarrow +\infty$.

Assume that $t_m^{\alpha-1} A(v_m) \rightarrow C$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, where $0 \leq C < +\infty$. Then $\lambda t_m^{\beta-1} B(v_m) \rightarrow 1 + C$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. By (2.11) we have $B(v_m) \leq C_0 \cdot A(v_m)^{1/p}$, where $0 < C_0 < +\infty$ does not depend on $m = 1, 2, \dots$. Therefore

$$t_m^{\beta-1} B(v_m) \leq C_0 \cdot t_m^{\beta-1} A(v_m)^{1/p} = t_m^{\beta-1+\frac{(1-\alpha)}{p}} (t_m^{\alpha-1} A(v_m))^{1/p}. \quad (4.4)$$

Let us show that

$$\beta - 1 + \frac{(1-\alpha)}{p} > 0. \quad (4.5)$$

Substituting $p = \frac{(2^*-1-\alpha)}{(2^*-1-\beta)}$ we get

$$\beta - 1 + \frac{(1-\alpha)}{p} = \frac{(\beta-1)(2^*-1-\alpha) + (1-\alpha)(2^*-1-\beta)}{(2^*-1-\alpha)}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & (\beta-1)(2^*-1-\alpha) + (1-\alpha)(2^*-1-\beta) = \\ & 2^*(\beta-\alpha) - (1+\alpha)(\beta-1) - (1-\alpha)(1+\beta) = \\ & 2^*(\beta-\alpha) - 2(\beta-\alpha) = (\beta-\alpha)(2^*-2) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

we get the desired conclusion. Hence the right hand side in (4.4) tends to zero and therefore $t_m^{\beta-1} B(v_m) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, which contradicts our assumption.

Assume now that $t_m^{\alpha-1} A(v_m) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Then by (4.3) we have

$$\frac{A(v_m)}{\lambda t_m^{\beta-\alpha} B(v_m)} \rightarrow 1 \quad (4.6)$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Using (2.11) we deduce

$$\frac{A(v_m)}{\lambda t_m^{\beta-\alpha} B(v_m)} > c_0 \frac{A(v_m)^{(p-1)/p}}{t_m^{\beta-\alpha}} = c_0 \frac{(t_m^{\alpha-1} A(v_m))^{(p-1)/p}}{t_m^{(p-1)(\alpha-1)/p+\beta-\alpha}}, \quad (4.7)$$

where $0 < c_0 < +\infty$ does not depend on $m = 1, 2, \dots$. Using (4.5) we get

$$\frac{(p-1)(\alpha-1)}{p} + \beta - \alpha = \beta - 1 + \frac{1-\alpha}{p} > 0.$$

This implies that the right hand side of (4.7) tends to $+\infty$, contrary to (4.6).

Thus (u_m) is bounded in H_0^1 , and hence by Sobolev's embedding theorem, (u_m) has a subsequence which converges weakly in H_0^1 and strongly in L_p , $1 < p < 2^*$. Denoting this subsequence again by (u_m) we get $u_m \rightarrow u_0$ weakly in H_0^1 and strongly in L_p , $1 < p < 2^*$ for some $u_0 \in H_0^1$. By the above, the sequences (t_m) and (v_m) are separated from zero and therefore $u_0 \neq 0$. Thus $E_\lambda(u_0) \leq \hat{E}_\lambda$ and $Q_\lambda(u_0) \leq 0$. Assume $Q_\lambda(u_0) < 0$. Then $Q_\lambda(t_\lambda^2(u_0)u_0) = 0$, i.e. $t_\lambda^2(u_0)u_0 \in M_\lambda$ and $E_\lambda(t_\lambda^2(u_0)u_0) < E_\lambda(u_0) \leq \hat{E}_\lambda$. Hence we get a contradiction and therefore $E_\lambda(u_0) = \hat{E}_\lambda$ and $Q_\lambda(u_0) = 0$. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.1. ■

From the definition (2.9) of Λ_0 and using arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4.1 it is not hard to derive

Corollary 4.2 *If $\lambda > \Lambda_0$, then $\hat{E}_\lambda < 0$. If $\Lambda_1 < \lambda < \Lambda_0$, then $0 < \hat{E}_\lambda < +\infty$, and if $\lambda = \Lambda_0$, then $\hat{E}_\lambda = 0$.*

4.2 Existence of the solution of (1.1).

Let $\lambda > \Lambda_1$ then by Lemma 4.1 there exists a solution $u_0 \in H_0^1 \setminus \{0\}$ of (4.1). This implies that there exist Lagrange multipliers μ_1, μ_2 such that

$$\mu_1 DE_\lambda(u_0) = \mu_2 DQ_\lambda(u_0), \quad (4.8)$$

and $|\mu_1| + |\mu_2| \neq 0$.

Proposition 4.2 *Let $\theta < 0$, $\lambda > \Lambda_1$ and $u_0 \in H_0^1$ be a solution of (4.1). Assume that $P_\lambda(u_0) \leq 0$. Then u_0 is a weak nonnegative solution of (1.1).*

Proof. Note that by Proposition 3.2 we have $L_\lambda(u_0) \neq 0$, since $\theta < 0$, $Q_\lambda(u_0) = 0$ and by the assumption $P_\lambda(u_0) \leq 0$. From (4.1) and (4.8) we have $0 = \mu_1 Q_\lambda(u_0) = \mu_2 L_\lambda(u_0)$. But $L_\lambda(u_0) \neq 0$ and therefore $\mu_2 = 0$. Thus by (4.8) we have $DE_\lambda(u_0) = 0$. Since $E_\lambda(|u_0|) = E_\lambda(u_0)$, $Q_\lambda(|u_0|) = Q_\lambda(u_0) = 0$ we may assume that $u_0 \geq 0$. This completes

the proof. ■

Corollary 4.3 *Let $\theta < 0$, $\lambda \geq \Lambda_0$ and $u_0 \in H_0^1$ be a solution of (4.1). Then $P_\lambda(u_0) < 0$ and u_0 is a weak solution of (1.1).*

Proof. Corollary 4.2 implies $\hat{E}_\lambda < 0$ when $\lambda > \Lambda_0$, and $\hat{E}_\lambda = 0$ when $\lambda = \Lambda_0$. Hence for any $\lambda \geq \Lambda_0$ we have $E_\lambda(u_0) \leq 0$ and therefore the identity $E_\lambda(u_0) = P_\lambda(u_0) + (1/2n)T(u_0)$ implies that $P_\lambda(u_0) < 0$. Applying now Proposition 4.2 we complete the proof. ■

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let us introduce

$$Z := \{\lambda > 0 : \exists u_\lambda \in M_\lambda \text{ s.t. } E_\lambda(u_\lambda) = \hat{E}_\lambda, P_\lambda(u_\lambda) < 0\}. \quad (5.1)$$

By assumption, $n > 2(1 + \alpha)(1 + \beta)/(1 - \alpha)(1 - \beta)$, i.e. $\theta < 0$. Hence Lemma 4.1 and Corollary 4.3 imply that Z is bounded below by Λ_1 and $[\Lambda_0, +\infty) \subset Z$, i.e. $Z \neq \emptyset$. Furthermore, Lemma 6.1 from Appendix yields that the maps $G_{(\cdot)}(u_{(\cdot)}) : \lambda \mapsto P_\lambda(u_\lambda)$, $E_{(\cdot)}(u_{(\cdot)}) : \lambda \mapsto E_\lambda(u_\lambda)$ are continuous functions in $(\Lambda_1, +\infty)$ and hence $Z \cap (\Lambda_1, +\infty)$ is an open set in $\mathbb{R}$.

Introduce

$$\lambda^* := \inf Z.$$

Lemma 5.1 *There exists a solution u^* of (4.1) with $\lambda = \lambda^*$. Furthermore, $\Lambda_1 < \lambda^*$ and $P_{\lambda^*}(u^*) = 0$.*

Proof. Since Z is an open set, we can find a sequence $\lambda_m \in Z$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$ such that $\lambda_m \rightarrow \lambda^*$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. By definition of Z for any $m = 1, 2, \dots$ there exists solution u_{λ_m} of (4.1) such that $P_{\lambda_m}(u_{\lambda_m}) < 0$. Lemma 6.1 from Appendix yields the existence of the limit solution u^* of (4.1) and the existence of a subsequence (again denoted by (u_{λ_m})) such that $u_{\lambda_m} \rightarrow u^*$ strongly in H^1 as $\lambda_m \rightarrow \lambda^*$. This yields by continuity that $P_{\lambda^*}(u^*) \leq 0$.

Let us show that $\Lambda_1 < \lambda^*$. To obtain a contradiction suppose, that $\Lambda_1 = \lambda^*$. Then by the proof of Lemma 6.1 from Appendix A we know that $\Lambda_1 = \lambda_1(u^*)$. Thus u^* is a critical point of $\lambda(u)$. This implies

that $t_0(u^*)u^*$ is a weak solution of (1.1) with $\lambda = \Lambda_0$. Note that since $P_{\lambda_m}(u_{\lambda_m}) < 0$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$, by Proposition 4.2 u_{λ_m} weakly satisfies (1.1) with $\lambda = \lambda_m$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$. From here and since $u_{\lambda_m} \rightarrow u^*$ strongly in H^1 as $\lambda_m \rightarrow \Lambda_1$, we derive that u^* is a weak solution of (1.1) with $\lambda = \Lambda_1$. But $\Lambda_1 \neq \Lambda_0$ and we get a contradiction.

Thus $\lambda^* \in (\Lambda_1, +\infty)$ and Z is an open subset in $(\Lambda_1, +\infty)$. Suppose, contrary to our claim, that $P_{\lambda^*}(u^*) < 0$. Then $\lambda^* \in Z$. However, since Z is an open set, this is impossible, and therefore $P_{\lambda^*}(u^*) = 0$. ■

Conclude of the proof of Theorem 1.1

By Proposition 4.2, u^* is a weak nonnegative solution of (1.1) and by Proposition 3.1 $u^* \in C^{1,\kappa}(\overline{\Omega})$ for $\kappa \in (0, 1)$. Hence by Lemma 3.1 Pohozaev's identity holds and whence $\int \left| \frac{\partial u^*}{\partial \nu} \right|^2 x \cdot \nu dx = 0$, since $P_{\lambda}(u^*) = 0$. By the assumption Ω is a strictly star-shaped domain with respect to the origin, i.e. $x \cdot \nu > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Therefore $\frac{\partial u^*}{\partial \nu} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$ and we have proved the existence of a non-regular solution u^* of (1.1) with $\lambda = \lambda^*$.

Let us now show that for any $\lambda > \lambda^*$ problem (1.1) has a non-regular solution. Let $\sigma > 1$. Then $\Omega_\sigma := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \cdot \sigma \in \Omega\} \subset \Omega$, since Ω is the star-shaped domain with respect to the origin. Let us set $u_\sigma^*(x) = u^*(x \cdot \sigma)$, $x \in \Omega_\sigma$, and $u_\sigma^*(x) = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\sigma$. Then the following identity

$$-\frac{1}{\sigma^2} \Delta u_\sigma^* = \lambda^* (u_\sigma^*)^\beta - (u_\sigma^*)^\alpha$$

weakly holds in Ω_σ . Furthermore, since $u_\sigma^* = 0$ and $\frac{\partial u_\sigma^*}{\partial \nu} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega_\sigma$, this identity weakly holds also in Ω . This implies that the function $w(x) = \sigma^{\frac{2}{1-\alpha}} \cdot u_\sigma^*(x)$ weakly satisfies problem (1.1) in Ω with $\lambda = \sigma^{\frac{2(\beta-\alpha)}{1-\alpha}} \cdot \lambda^*$. Note that $\lambda > \lambda^*$, since $\sigma > 1$. This implies that for any $\lambda \geq \lambda^*$ problem (1.1) has a non-regular solution.

Let us prove the second part of the Theorem. Note that by Proposition 4.2 to any $\lambda \in Z$ it corresponds a weak nonnegative solution w_λ . Furthermore, Pohozaev's identity implies that $\int \left| \frac{\partial w_\lambda}{\partial \nu} \right|^2 x \cdot \nu dx > 0$, since $P_\lambda(w_\lambda) < 0$. Hence there exists a subset $U \subseteq \partial\Omega$ of positive $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lebesgue measure such that $\frac{\partial w_\lambda}{\partial \nu}(s) \neq 0$ for every $s \in U$.

Since Z is an open set, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find $\lambda_0 \in Z$ such that $\lambda_0 > \lambda^*$ and $\lambda_0 - \lambda^* < \varepsilon$. Consider the solution w_{λ_0} . Then for any

$\lambda > \lambda_0$ the function w_{λ_0} is a sub-solution of (1.1).

Let us show that (1.1) has a super-solution. To this end consider the solution $e \in C^1(\Omega)$ of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta e = 1, & x \in \Omega, \\ e|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

By the maximum principle for elliptic equations [2] it follows that $e(x) > 0$ on Ω and $\frac{\partial e}{\partial \nu}(s) < 0$ for every $s \in \partial\Omega$. Denote $\|e\|_\infty = \sup_\Omega |e(x)|$. Then there exists a sufficient large number $M(\lambda)$ such that the following inequality

$$M - \lambda M^\beta \|e\|_\infty^\beta > 0$$

holds for any $M > M(\lambda)$. Hence and by (5.2) we have

$$M = -\Delta(Me(x)) \geq \lambda(Me(x))^\beta - (Me(x))^\alpha \text{ for all } x \in \Omega.$$

Therefore $\bar{u}_\lambda = Me$ for any $M > M(\lambda)$ is a super-solution of (1.1). Furthermore, if $M > M(\lambda)$ is a sufficiently large number, then $\bar{u}_\lambda(x) > w_{\lambda_0}(x)$ in Ω . Thus we may appeal to the method of sub- and super-solutions and therefore there exists a weak solution $w_\lambda \in C^{1,\kappa}(\bar{\Omega})$ for $\kappa \in (0,1)$. The inequality $w_\lambda \geq w_{\lambda_0}$ yields that this solution is not of non-regular solution. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ has been taken arbitrary, this completes the proof of the Theorem. $\blacksquare$

By Corollary 4.3 we know that $P_{\Lambda_0}(u_{\Lambda_0}) < 0$. This and Lemma 5.1 yield that

Corollary 5.1 $\lambda^* < \Lambda_0$.

6 Appendix A

Lemma 6.1 *Assume $\lambda \in [\Lambda_1, +\infty)$ and u_{λ_m} is a sequence of solutions of (4.1), where $\lambda_m \rightarrow \lambda$ as $m \rightarrow +\infty$. Then there exists a subsequence (again denoted by (u_{λ_m})) and the limit solution u_λ of (4.1) such that $u_{\lambda_m} \rightarrow u_\lambda$ strongly in H^1 as $m \rightarrow +\infty$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in [\Lambda_1, +\infty)$ and u_{λ_m} be a sequence of solutions of (4.1), where $\lambda_m \rightarrow \lambda$ as $m \rightarrow +\infty$. Let $t_m \geq 0$ and $v_m \in H_0^1$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$, be such that $u_{\lambda_m} = t_m v_m$, $\|v_m\|_1 = 1$.

As in the proof of Lemma 4.1 using (4.3) it is derived that $\{t_m\}$ is bounded. This implies that the set $\{u_{\lambda_m}\}$, $m = 1, 2, \dots$ is bounded in H_0^1 . Hence by the Sobolev embedding theorem and by the Eberlein-Šmulian theorem we may assume that $u_{\lambda_m} \rightarrow \bar{u}_\lambda$ strongly in $L_p(\Omega)$, where $1 < p < 2^*$, and $u_{\lambda_m} \rightharpoonup \bar{u}_\lambda$ weakly in H_0^1 as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ for some limit point $\bar{u}_\lambda$. This yields that $\bar{u}_\lambda \in H_0^1$ is a weak nonnegative solution of (1.1). As in the proof of Lemma 4.1 using (4.3) it is derived that $\bar{u}_\lambda \neq 0$.

Thus we have

$$E_\lambda(\bar{u}_\lambda) \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} E_{\lambda_m}(u_{\lambda_m}), \quad (6.1)$$

$$Q_\lambda(\bar{u}_\lambda) \leq 0. \quad (6.2)$$

Let first consider the case $\lambda > \Lambda_1$. By Lemma 4.1 there exists a solution u_λ of (4.1), i.e. $u_\lambda \in M_\lambda$ and $\hat{E}_\lambda = E_\lambda(u_\lambda)$. Then

$$|E_\lambda(u_\lambda) - E_{\lambda_m}(u_\lambda)| < C|\lambda - \lambda_m|, \quad (6.3)$$

where $C < +\infty$. Furthermore, we have

$$E_{\lambda_m}(u_\lambda) \geq E_{\lambda_m}(t_{\lambda_m}^2(u_\lambda)u_\lambda) \geq E_{\lambda_m}(u_{\lambda_m})$$

provided that m is a sufficiently large number. Thus by (6.3) we have

$$E_\lambda(u_\lambda) + C|\lambda - \lambda_m| > E_{\lambda_m}(u_\lambda) \geq E_{\lambda_m}(u_{\lambda_m}),$$

and therefore $\hat{E}_\lambda := E_\lambda(u_\lambda) \geq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} E_{\lambda_m}(u_{\lambda_m})$. Using now (6.1) we deduce

$$E_\lambda(\bar{u}_\lambda) \leq \hat{E}_\lambda.$$

Assume $Q_\lambda(\bar{u}_\lambda) < 0$. Then $Q_\lambda(t_\lambda^2(\bar{u}_\lambda)\bar{u}_\lambda) = 0$, i.e. $t_\lambda^2(\bar{u}_\lambda)\bar{u}_\lambda \in M_\lambda$ and $E_\lambda(t_\lambda^2(\bar{u}_\lambda)\bar{u}_\lambda) < E_\lambda(\bar{u}_\lambda) \leq \hat{E}_\lambda$. Hence we get a contradiction and therefore $E_\lambda(\bar{u}_\lambda) = \hat{E}_\lambda$, $Q_\lambda(\bar{u}_\lambda) = 0$. Furthermore, $u_{\lambda_m} \rightarrow \bar{u}_\lambda$ strongly in H^1 as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ since $Q_\lambda(\bar{u}_\lambda) = 0$ and hence, we get the proof of the lemma in the case $\lambda > \Lambda_1$.

Assume now that $\lambda = \Lambda_1$. Then $\Lambda_1 < \lambda_m$. By definition (2.7) we see that $\Lambda_1 < \lambda_1(u_{\lambda_m}) \leq \lambda_m$ and therefore $\lambda_1(u_{\lambda_m}) \rightarrow \Lambda_1$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Thus (u_{λ_m}) is the minimizing sequence of (2.9) and as above we deduce that $\lambda_1(\bar{u}_\lambda) = \Lambda_1$. This implies the proof of the lemma when $\lambda = \Lambda_1$. ■

References

- [1] Díaz, J.I., Hernández, J., *Global bifurcation and continua of non-negative solutions for a quasilinear elliptic problem*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, V. 329, (1999), p. 587-592.
- [2] Gilbarg, D., Trudinger, N.S., *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*. 2nd edition, Grundlehren 224, Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York-Tokyo (1983).
- [3] Il'yasov, Y.S., *Nonlocal investigations of bifurcations of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*, Izv. Math. 66 no. 6, (2002), 1103–1130.
- [4] Pohozaev, S.I., *Eigenfunctions of the equation $\Delta u + \lambda f(u) = 0$* . Sov. Math. Doklady **5**, (1965), 1408-1411.
- [5] Rosenau, P., Hyman, J. M., *Compactons: Solitons with finite wavelength*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (5), (1993), 564–567.
- [6] Struwe, M., *Variational Methods, Application to Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations and Hamiltonian Systems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New-York, 1996.